

**REMARKS**

Applicants and Applicants' attorney would like to thank Examiner Coulter for his time for a telephone conversation on May 10, 2005 during which it was confirmed that with respect to the amendments to claims set forth herein, in accordance with the current reissue rules governing amendments, indication of the deleted language should not be set forth in the amendment. It is noted that an appendix illustrating the amendments made to the foregoing claims was supplied as a courtesy to the Examiner in the previous response filed on November 19, 2004. It is further noted that the claims 80 and 83 have been revised to delete the term "said" which was inadvertently included in the amended claims. The remaining portion of this paper is substantially identical to the paper previously submitted on November 19, 2004.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representatives Lawrence Cullen and Yoshinobu Idogawa during a interview on November 10, 2004.

During the interview, Applicants advised the Examiner that several claims would be cancelled to be placed in a divisional application. Applicants also explained the invention in claims 80 and above and the Matsuzaki reference. Particularly, Applicants explained that Matsuzaki discloses either sign bit or 0 bit expansion according to the type of operation to be performed, rather than according to a designation of a register unit. It is Applicants' understanding that the Examiner appreciated the distinctions.

**I. Introduction**

Claims 80-94 are pending in the above application.

Claims 80-94 stand rejected under 36 U.S.C. §102.

## **II. Amendments**

Claims 1-79 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application on claims 1-79.

Claims 80, 83, 85, 88, 91 and 94 have been amended to be in better grammatical form and/or to remove any possibility of being interpreted as containing mean plus function terminology.

The amendments to the claims have been made with respect to the original patent claims as set forth by MPEP 1453.

No new matter has been added.

## **III. Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 80-94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,440,701) (hereafter "Matsuzaki").

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed in a prior art reference as arranged in the claim. See, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Matsuzaki does not disclose a processor which has a first register, a second register, a zero-extending unit, and a sign extending unit, wherein the zero-extending unit zero-extends data when the instruction designates the first register unit and the sign-extending unit sign-extends data when the instruction designates the second register unit, as required by amended claim 80. Independent claims 83, 85, 88, 91, and 94 also each contain limitations directed toward performing either sign extension or zero extension according to a designation of a register.

Matsuzaki discloses either sign bit or 0 bit expansion according to the type of operation to be performed. Col. 4: 57-68.

Accordingly, as Matsuzaki does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 80, 83, 85, 88, 91, and 94, Matsuzaki does not anticipate claims 80, 83, 85, 88, 91, and 94. As dependent claims contain all of the limitations of their base claims, claims 81, 82, 84, 86, 86, 89 92 and 93 also are not anticipated by Matsuzaki.


#### **IV. Conclusion**

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
(202) 756-8000  
**Date: May 11, 2005**  
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087

WDC99 1080910-1.067471.0011